arXiv:1702.08890v1 [math.AG] 28 Feb 2017

DIMENSION OF THE SPACE OF CONICS ON FANO HYPERSURFACES

KATSUHISA FURUKAWA

Abstract. R. Beheshti showed that, for a smooth Fano hypersurface X of degree $\leqslant 8$ over the complex number field $\mathbb{C}$, the dimension of the space of lines lying in X is equal to the expected dimension.

We study the space of conics on X. In this case, if X contains some linear subvariety, then the dimension of the space can be larger than the expected dimension.

In this paper, we show that, for a smooth Fano hypersurface X of degree $\leqslant 6$ over $\mathbb{C}$, and for an irreducible component R of the space of conics lying in X, if the 2-plane spanned by a general conic of R is not contained in X, then the dimension of R is equal to the expected dimension.

1. Introduction

Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a hypersurface of degree d over the complex number field $\mathbb{C}$. We define $R_e(X)$ to be the space of smooth rational curves of degree e in $\mathbb{P}^n$ lying in X, which is an open subscheme of the Hilbert scheme $\mathrm{Hilb}^{et+1}(X)$. The number

$$(n+1-d)e+n-4$$

is called the *expected dimension* of $R_e(X)$, where the dimension of $R_e(X)$ at C is greater than or equal to this number if there exists $C \in R_e(X)$ such that X is smooth along C.

The space of rational curves on a *general* Fano hypersurface have been studied by many authors ([1], [7], [8], [12], [4], [11] in characteristic zero; [9, V, §4], [6] in any characteristic). At least for $e = 1, 2$, it is well known that $R_e(X)$ has the expected dimension if X is a general Fano hypersurface.

On the other hand, it is difficult to know about $R_e(X)$ for *any smooth* X. In the case of $e = 1$, as an answer of the question which was asked by O. Debarre and J. de Jong independently, R. Beheshti [2] showed that $R_1(X)$ has the expected dimension if $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is a smooth Fano hypersurface of degree $d \leqslant 6$. J. M. Landsberg and C. Robles [10] gave another proof for the same degree $d \leqslant 6$. Beheshti [3] later showed the same statement for $d \leqslant 8$.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14C05, 14J70, 14N05.

Key words and phrases. space of rational curves, Fano hypersurface, expected dimension.

In the case of $e = 2$, A. Collino, J. P. Murre, G. E. Welters [5] studied $R_2(X)$ for a smooth quartic 3-fold $X \subset \mathbb{P}^4$; in this case, $R_2(X)$ has the expected dimension. Note that $\mathrm{Hilb}^{2t+1}(X)$ is connected for any smooth hypersurface $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ if the expected dimension is positive [6, Proposition 5.6].

In this paper, we study the dimension of $R_2(X)$ for a smooth Fano hypersurface of degree $d \leqslant 6$. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a smooth Fano hypersurface of degree $d \leqslant 6$ over $\mathbb{C}$. Let $R \neq \emptyset$ be an irreducible component of $R_2(X)$ such that*

$$\langle C \rangle \not\subset X \text{ for general } C \in R, \tag{1}$$

where $\langle C \rangle = \mathbb{P}^2 \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is the 2-plane spanned by C. Then $\dim(R)$ is equal to the expected dimension $3n - 2d - 2$.

The dimension of $R_2(X)$ can be greater than the expected one when X contains certain linear varieties (see Example 3.13); this is the reason why we assume the condition (1). The statement of Theorem 1.1 does not hold for $d \geqslant 10$ (see Example 3.14); thus it may need some conditions stronger than (1) for larger d.

The paper is organized as follows. We assume that $\dim R$ is greater than the expected dimension, and take $Y := \mathrm{Loc}(R) \subset X$ to be the locus swept out by conics of R. The codimension of Y is $\geqslant 2$ in X due to a result of Beheshti [3] (see Remark 2.2). Then it is sufficient to investigate the case when $(d, \dim Y) = (6, n-3)$. In §2, we consider the linear subvariety $\langle Y \rangle \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ spanned by Y, and show that it is not so small by using projective techniques (Proposition 2.6). In §3, we consider the subset $R_x^\star \subset R$ consisting of conics C such that $x \in C \subset \mathbb{T}_x X$, and show that $\langle \mathrm{Loc}(R_x^\star) \rangle \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is small (Proposition 3.6), where $\mathbb{T}_x X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is the embedded tangent space at x. It contradicts that $\langle Y \rangle$ is not small in many cases. We also find contradictions in the rest cases, and give the proof of Theorem 1.1.

2. The locus swept out by conics

We use the following notations. For a Fano hypersurface $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ of degree $d \leqslant 6$, we take an irreducible component $R \neq \emptyset$ of $R_2(X)$ such that $\langle C \rangle \not\subset X$ for general $C \in R_2(X)$. We denote by $\bar{R}$ the closure in $\mathrm{Hilb}^{2t+1}(X)$. Let

$$\mathcal{U} := \{ (C, x) \in R \times X \mid x \in C \}$$

be the universal family of R, and let $\pi : \mathcal{U} \to R$ and $\mathrm{ev} : \mathcal{U} \to X$ be the first and second projections. For a subset $A \subset R$, we write $\mathcal{U}_A := \pi^{-1}(A)$ and $\mathrm{Loc}(A) := \overline{\mathrm{ev}(\mathcal{U}_A)} = \overline{\bigcup_{C \in A} C} \subset X$.

We write $R_x \subset R$ to be the set of $C \in R$ passing through $x \in X$, and write $R_{xy} = R_x \cap R_y \subset R$, the set of $C \in R$ passing through $x, y \in X$.

We set $\langle S_1 \cdots S_m \rangle \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ to be the linear variety spanned by subsets $S_1, \ldots, S_m \subset \mathbb{P}^n$. For example, $\langle xy \rangle \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is the line passing through $x, y \in \mathbb{P}^n$, and $\langle C \rangle \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is the 2-plane spanned by C for a conic $C \subset \mathbb{P}^n$.

The condition (1) in Theorem 1.1 gives the following basic property for R_{xy}.

Lemma 2.1. *Let R'_{xy} be an irreducible component of R_{xy} such that $\langle C \rangle \not\subset X$ for general $C \in R'_{xy}$. Then*

$$\mathcal{U}_{R'_{xy}} \to \mathrm{Loc}(R'_{xy}) \subset X$$

is generically finite; moreover a fiber at $z \in \mathrm{Loc}(R'_{xy})$ is of positive dimension only if $\langle xyz \rangle \subset X$. In particular, $\dim \mathrm{Loc}(R'_{xy}) = \dim(R'_{xy}) + 1$.

Proof. If $\dim R'_{xy} = 0$, then the assertion follows immediately. Assume $\dim R'_{xy} \geqslant 1$. Then $\dim \mathrm{Loc}(R'_{xy}) \geqslant 2$. Take $C \in R'_{xy}$ and $z \in C$ such that $M := \langle xyz \rangle = \langle C \rangle \not\subset X$. Then $M \cap X$ is a union of finitely many curves. Since any conic $\tilde{C} \in \pi(\mathrm{ev}^{-1}(z) \cap \mathcal{U}_{R'_{xy}})$ satisfies $\tilde{C} \subset M$, it coincides with a component of $M \cap X$. Hence the fiber $\mathrm{ev}^{-1}(z) \cap \mathcal{U}_{R'_{xy}}$ must be a finite set. □

We set $Y := \mathrm{Loc}(R) \subset X$, the locus swept out by conics $C \in R$, which is non-linear since $\langle C \rangle \not\subset X$ for general C. Let us consider the projection

$$\mathrm{ev}^{(2)} : \mathcal{U} \times_R \mathcal{U} \simeq \{ (C, x, y) \in R \times Y \times Y \mid x, y \in C \} \to Y \times Y \tag{2}$$

whose fiber at $(x, y) \in Y \times Y$ is isomorphic to R_{xy}. Considering $\mathcal{U} \times_R \mathcal{U} \to R$, we have $\dim \mathcal{U} \times_R \mathcal{U} = r + 2$. Note that $\mathrm{ev}^{(2)}$ is dominant if and only if $\mathrm{Loc}(R_x) = Y$ holds for general $x \in Y$.

Remark 2.2. By a result of R. Beheshti [3, Theorem 3.2(b)], we have $\dim Y \leqslant n - 3$ if $\dim R$ is greater than the expected dimension.

We immediately have $\dim Y \leqslant n - 2$; this is because if $X = Y = \mathrm{Loc}(R)$ in characteristic zero, then R has a free curve C and then R must have expected dimension. Beheshti's result gives the inequity which is sharper than this.

Lemma 2.3. *If $d \leqslant 6$ and $r = \dim R$ is greater than the expected dimension, then $(d, \dim Y) = (6, n - 3)$.*

Proof. We have $\dim Y \leqslant n - 3$ due to Beheshti's result as we saw in Remark 2.2. Let $(C, x, y) \in \mathcal{U} \times_R \mathcal{U}$ be general. Since $\mathrm{Loc}(R_{xy}) \subset Y$, it follows from the morphism (2) and Lemma 2.1 that $(r + 2 - 2\dim(Y)) + 1 \leqslant \dim(Y)$. Hence $r + 3 - 3\dim(Y) \leqslant 0$. By assumption, $r \geqslant 3n - 2d - 1$. Thus

$$3n - 2d + 2 - 3\dim(Y) \leqslant 0.$$

Since $\dim Y \leqslant n - 3$, we have $11 - 2d \leqslant 0$; hence $d = 6$. Therefore $n - 10/3 \leqslant \dim(Y)$; hence $\dim(Y) = n - 3$. □

Let us study the case $(d, \dim Y) = (6, n-3)$, and assume that $r := \dim R$ is greater than the expected dimension, that is to say,

$$r \geqslant 3n - 13. \tag{3}$$

Lemma 2.4. $\mathrm{ev}^{(2)}$ *is dominant. Therefore* $\mathrm{Loc}(R_x) = Y$ *for general* $x \in Y$.

Proof. For general $(x, y) \in \mathrm{im}(\mathrm{ev}^{(2)})$, we have $\dim R_{xy} = (r+2) - \dim(\mathrm{im}(\mathrm{ev}^{(2)}))$, which implies $\dim R_{xy} + \dim(\mathrm{im}(\mathrm{ev}^{(2)})) = (r+2) \geqslant 3n - 11$.

Suppose that $\mathrm{ev}^{(2)}$ is not dominant, that is, $\dim(\mathrm{im}(\mathrm{ev}^{(2)})) < 2(n-3)$. Then $\mathrm{Loc}(R_{xy}) \neq Y$, which implies $\dim R_{xy} + 1 < \dim Y = n-3$ because of Lemma 2.1. Then $\dim R_{xy} + \dim(\mathrm{im}(\mathrm{ev}^{(2)})) \leqslant (n-5) + (2(n-3)-1) = 3n-12$, a contradiction. □

Note that for any $x, y \in Y$

$$\dim R_{xy} \geqslant r + 2 - 2\dim(Y) \geqslant n - 5. \tag{4}$$

Hereafter we will use several projective techniques in order to study Y.

Remark 2.5. We sometimes consider the *Gauss map* of a variety $Z \subset \mathbb{P}^n$, which is a rational map,

$$\gamma_Z : Z \dashrightarrow \mathbb{G}(\dim Z, \mathbb{P}^n),$$

sending a smooth point $x \in Z$ to the embedded tangent space $\mathbb{T}_x Z \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ at x. A general fiber of γ_Z is a linear variety of $\mathbb{P}^n$ in characteristic zero. The map γ_Z is a finite morphism if Z is smooth. See [13, I, §2].

We write $(\mathbb{P}^n)^\vee = \mathbb{G}(n-1, \mathbb{P}^n)$, the space of hyperplanes of $\mathbb{P}^n$. For a linear subvariety $A \subset \mathbb{P}^n$, we denote by $A^* \subset (\mathbb{P}^n)^\vee$ the set of hyperplanes containing A. In addition, for a subset $B \subset \mathbb{P}^n$, we set $\mathrm{Cone}_A(B) := \overline{\bigcup_{x \in B} \langle A, x \rangle} \subset \mathbb{P}^n$, the cone of B with vertex A.

Let us consider the linear variety $\langle Y \rangle \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ spanned by the locus $Y \subset X$. The following proposition states $\langle Y \rangle$ cannot be so small in $\mathbb{P}^n$, though Y is much smaller than X.

Proposition 2.6. *Assume* $(d, \dim Y) = (6, n-3)$ *and the formula* (3). *Then* $\langle Y \rangle$ *is of dimension* $\geqslant n-1$.

Proof. Since Y is non-linear, we immediately have $\dim\langle Y \rangle > n-3$. Now assume that $\langle Y \rangle$ is an $(n-2)$-plane. We need to show two claims.

Claim 2.7. *It holds that* $Y = \langle Y \rangle \cap X$ *and* $\dim(\mathrm{Sing}\, Y) \leqslant 1$. *In particular,* $Y \subset \langle Y \rangle = \mathbb{P}^{n-2}$ *is a hypersurface whose degree is equal to* $\deg X = d = 6$.

Proof. For $x \in \langle Y \rangle \cap X$, it holds that $x \in \mathrm{Sing}(\langle Y \rangle \cap X)$ if and only if $\langle Y \rangle \subset \mathbb{T}_x X$. It means that $\gamma_X(\mathrm{Sing}(\langle Y \rangle \cap X)) \subset \langle Y \rangle^*$ for the Gauss map $\gamma_X : X \to (\mathbb{P}^n)^\vee$, where $\langle Y \rangle^* \subset (\mathbb{P}^n)^\vee$ is the set of hyperplanes containing $\langle Y \rangle$. Since X is smooth, γ_X is a finite morphism. Since $\dim \langle Y \rangle^* = 1$, we have $\dim(\mathrm{Sing}(\langle Y \rangle \cap X)) \leqslant 1$. If there exists an irreducible component $Y' \subset \langle Y \rangle \cap X \subset \langle Y \rangle = \mathbb{P}^{n-2}$ such that $Y' \neq Y$, then we have $\dim(Y' \cap Y) \geqslant n-4 \geqslant 2$, which is a contradiction since $Y' \cap Y \subset \mathrm{Sing}(\langle Y \rangle \cap X)$. Thus $\langle Y \rangle \cap X = Y$. □

Claim 2.8. *A general $C \in R$ satisfies $C \cap \mathrm{Sing}\, Y \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Suppose that a general conic $C \in R$ satisfies $C \cap \mathrm{Sing}\, Y = \emptyset$. Since $Y = \mathrm{Loc}(R)$ and the characteristic is zero, C is free in Y. Then $R_2(Y)$ is smooth at C and has the expected dimension $3(n-2) - 2\deg Y - 2$. This contradicts that $R \subset R_2(Y)$ is of dimension $> 3n - 2d - 2$, where $\deg Y = \deg X = d$ because of Claim 2.7. □

From Claim 2.8, we may indeed assume

$$C \cap S \neq \emptyset \tag{5}$$

for an irreducible component $S \subset \mathrm{Sing}\, Y$. Note that $\dim S \leqslant 1$.

First we consider the case $n > 6$. Let $C_0 \in R$ be a general conic such that $\langle C_0 \rangle \not\subset X$, and take $x, y \in C_0 \setminus S$ be general. From (4), we have $\dim R_{xy} \geqslant n-5 \geqslant 2$. Let $R'_{xy} \subset R_{xy}$ be an irreducible component containing C_0, and take $(R'_{xy})^\circ \subset R'_{xy}$ to be the set of C satisfying $\langle C \rangle \not\subset X$. Then, for any $C \in (R'_{xy})^\circ$ and $s \in C \cap S$, we have $\langle xys \rangle = \langle C \rangle \not\subset X$. From Lemma 2.1, for the morphism

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{ev}} := \mathrm{ev}\,|_{\mathcal{U}_{(R'_{xy})^\circ}} : \mathcal{U}_{(R'_{xy})^\circ} \to \mathrm{Loc}(R'_{xy}),$$

the preimage $\widetilde{\mathrm{ev}}^{-1}(S)$ is of dimension $\leqslant 1$. Since $\dim R'_{xy} \geqslant 2$, we have $\pi(\widetilde{\mathrm{ev}}^{-1}(S)) \neq R'_{xy}$, which means that $C \cap S = \emptyset$ for general $C \in R'_{xy}$, a contradiction.

Next we consider the case $n = 6$, and complete the proof in the following four steps. Note that $\langle Y \rangle = \mathbb{P}^4 \subset \mathbb{P}^6$.

Step 1. We show that $S \not\subset \langle C_0 \rangle$ for general $C_0 \in R$, and also show that $S \not\subset M$ for a general 3-plane $M \subset \langle Y \rangle$ containing C_0.

Suppose $S \subset \langle C_0 \rangle$ for general $C_0 \in R$, and take $x, y \in Y$ be general points. We can assume $y \notin \mathrm{Cone}_x(S)$. Since $\dim R_{xy} \geqslant n-5 \geqslant 1$, taking general $C, C' \in R_{xy}$ with $C \neq C'$, we have $S \subset \langle C \rangle \cap \langle C' \rangle = \langle xy \rangle$, a contradiction.

If $S \subset M$ for a general 3-plane M containing C_0, then we can also take another general $\tilde{M} \neq M$, and then $\langle C_0 \rangle = M \cap \tilde{M} \supset S$, a contradiction.

Step 2. We consider $\langle Y \rangle^\vee := \mathbb{G}(3, \langle Y \rangle)$, the set of 3-planes in $\langle Y \rangle = \mathbb{P}^4$. Let

$$W = \{ (C, M) \in R \times \langle Y \rangle^\vee \mid C \subset M \},$$

which is a $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle over R; in particular, $\dim W \geqslant 6$. Let $\mathrm{pr}_2 : W \to \langle Y \rangle^\vee$ be the projection to the second factor.

For general $(C_0, M) \in W$, take R^M to be an irreducible component of $R \cap R_2(M)$ containing C_0. We may assume that a general conic $C \in R^M$ satisfies $\langle C \rangle \not\subset X$. Since $R \cap R_2(M) \simeq \mathrm{pr}_2^{-1}(M)$, we can assume $\dim R^M \geqslant 6 - \dim(\mathrm{pr}_2(W))$. We set the surface

$$Y^M := \mathrm{Loc}(R^M) \subset Y \cap M.$$

Step 3. Assume $\dim \mathrm{pr}_2(W) \leqslant 3$. Then we have $\dim R^M \geqslant 3$, which implies that $R^M \to \mathbb{G}(2, M) = (\mathbb{P}^3)^\vee : C \mapsto \langle C \rangle$ is dominant. From Step 1, $S \cap M$ is a set of finite points. Thus $L \cap S = \emptyset$ for a general 2-plane $L \subset M$. Taking a general $C \in R^M$ such that $\langle C \rangle = L$, we find that $C \cap S = \emptyset$, which contradicts the condition (5).

Step 4. Assume $\dim \mathrm{pr}_2(W) = 4$, that is, $\mathrm{pr}_2(W) = \langle Y \rangle^\vee$. For general $(C_0, M) \in W$, since M is general in $\langle Y \rangle^\vee$, $Y \cap M$ is irreducible. Then $Y^M = Y \cap M \subset M = \mathbb{P}^3$, which is a surface whose degree is equal to $\deg Y = 6$.

Since $S \cap M$ is a finite set, we may assume that there exists $s \in S \cap M$ such that $s \in C$ for general $C \in R^M$. This implies that $R^M \subset R_s$. Considering $\mathcal{U}_{R^M} \to Y^M$, we find that $\dim(R^M \cap R_x) \geqslant 1$ for general $x \in Y^M$. Since Y^M is surface,

$$Y^M = \mathrm{Loc}(R^M \cap R_x) = \mathrm{Loc}(R^M \cap R_{xs}).$$

For general $C \in R^M$, we show that $\langle C \rangle \cap Y^M$ is scheme-theoretically equal to C, as follows. Write $(\langle C \rangle \cap Y^M)_{red} = C \cup \bigcup_i E_i$ with the irreducible components E_i's. Take a general $x \in C \setminus \bigcup_i E_i$ and take a general $y \in E_1 \setminus (C \cup \langle xs \rangle)$. Taking the closure

$$\overline{R^M \cap R_{xs}} \subset \mathrm{Hilb}^{2t+1}(X)$$

and consider the surjective map $\mathcal{U}_{\overline{R^M \cap R_{xs}}} \to Y^M$, we find $\tilde{C} \in \overline{R^M \cap R_{xs}}$ such that $x, y, s \in \tilde{C}$. Then $\langle \tilde{C} \rangle = \langle xys \rangle = \langle C \rangle$, which implies that $\tilde{C} \subset Y^M \cap \langle C \rangle$. By the choice of x, it follows $C \subset \tilde{C}$. Then $C = \tilde{C}$, which implies $y \in C$, a contradiction.

Thus $(\langle C \rangle \cap Y^M)_{red} = C$. Suppose that $\langle C \rangle \cap Y^M$ is non-reduced, which means that C is a contact locus on Y^M of $\langle C \rangle$, i.e., $\gamma(C) = \langle C \rangle \in \mathbb{G}(2, M)$ for the Gauss map

$$\gamma = \gamma_{Y^M} : Y^M \dashrightarrow \mathbb{G}(2, M)$$

sending $x \mapsto \mathbb{T}_x Y^M$. Then $\dim \gamma(Y^M) = 1$. Since $Y^M = \mathrm{Loc}(R^M)$, $\langle C \rangle \in \gamma(Y^M)$ is a general point if so is $C \in R^M$. As in Remark 2.5, the general fiber $\gamma^{-1}(\langle C \rangle)$ is a linear variety, which contradicts $C \subset \gamma^{-1}(\langle C \rangle)$.

Thus $\langle C \rangle \cap Y^M = C$ scheme-theoretically. This contradicts $\deg Y^M = 6$. □

Remark 2.9. We discuss any hypersurface of $\mathbb{P}^n$ with $n \geqslant d = 6$ since it may not be possible to reduce our problem to the case of $n = d = 6$. If $\{ (C, P) \in R \times \mathbb{G}(6, \mathbb{P}^n) \mid C \subset P \} \to \mathbb{G}(6, \mathbb{P}^n)$ is dominant (the fiber at P is isomorphic to $R \cap R_2(X \cap P)$), then the expected dimension of $R \subset R_e(X)$ can be calculated by using the incidence correspondence and the case of $n = 6$; however we do not know whether the map is dominant.

Actually, the case of $n = d = 6$ is the harder part to show as in the proof of Proposition 2.6 above.

3. Special point of a conic: the embedded tangent space at the point containing the conic

We use the notations of §2. Assume $(d, \dim Y) = (6, n-3)$ and the formula (3).

Lemma 3.1. *Let $(C, x) \in \mathcal{U}$. Then the following holds.*

(a) *$C \not\subset \mathbb{T}_x X$ if and only if $\mathbb{T}_x X \cap C = \{ x \}$.*
(b) *$C \subset \mathbb{T}_x X$ if and only if one of the following conditions holds:* (i) *$\langle C \rangle \subset X$;* (ii) *$\langle C \rangle \cap X$ is non-reduced along C;* (iii) *$x \in C \cap E$ for some irreducible component $E \neq C$ of $\langle C \rangle \cap X$.*

Proof. (a) Since $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is a hypersurface and C is a smooth conic, if $C \not\subset \mathbb{T}_x X$, then we have $\mathbb{T}_x X \cap C \subset \mathbb{T}_x X \cap (\langle C \rangle \cap C) = \mathbb{T}_x C \cap C = \{ x \}$.

(b) It is sufficient to consider the case when $\langle C \rangle \not\subset X$. If $C \subset \mathbb{T}_x X$, then $\langle C \rangle \subset \mathbb{T}_x X$, and then $\langle C \rangle \cap X$ is singular at x. This means that (ii) or (iii) holds. □

For a smooth conic $C \subset X$, we always have a point $x \in C$ satisfying $C \subset \mathbb{T}_x X$, as follows. Since $\deg(X) = 6$, if (i) and (ii) does not hold, then we have a curve $E \neq C$ in $\langle C \rangle \cap X$, and have a point $x \in C \cap E \subset \langle C \rangle = \mathbb{P}^2$ as in (iii).

Definition 3.2. We set $\mathcal{U}^\star \subset \mathcal{U}$ to an irreducible component of $\{ (C, x) \in \mathcal{U} \mid C \subset \mathbb{T}_x X \}$ such that $\mathcal{U}^\star \to R$ is dominant, and set $R^\star_x := \pi(\mathrm{ev}^{-1}(x) \cap \mathcal{U}^\star)$, which consists of conics $C \subset X$ such that

$$x \in C \subset \mathbb{T}_x X.$$

Note that $\mathrm{Loc}(R^\star_x) \subset \mathbb{T}_x X$.

Lemma 3.3. $\mathcal{U}^\star \neq \mathcal{U}$.

Proof. We consider the Gauss map $\gamma : X \to (\mathbb{P}^n)^\vee$. If $\mathcal{U}^\star = \mathcal{U}$, then it follows from Lemma 2.4 that $Y = \mathrm{Loc}(R_x) = \mathrm{Loc}(R_x^\star) \subset \mathbb{T}_x X$ for general $x \in Y$, and then $\mathbb{T}_x X = \langle Y \rangle \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ because of Proposition 2.6. Then $\gamma(Y) = \langle Y \rangle \in (\mathbb{P}^n)^\vee$, which contradicts that γ is a finite morphism as we mentioned in Remark 2.5. □

Lemma 3.4. *Let $x \neq y \in Y$ satisfy $y \in \mathbb{T}_x X$. Then $C \subset \mathbb{T}_x X$ for any $C \in R_{xy}$.*

Proof. Take $C \in R_{xy}$ and suppose $C \not\subset \mathbb{T}_x X$. Since $\langle C \rangle \not\subset \mathbb{T}_x X$, $\langle C \rangle \cap \mathbb{T}_x X$ is the line passing through x and y. On the other hand, we have $\langle C \rangle \cap \mathbb{T}_x X = \mathbb{T}_x C$, which does not intersect with any point of C except x since C is a smooth conic, a contradiction. Thus we have $C \subset \mathbb{T}_x X$. □

Now assume that $\mathcal{U}^\star \neq \mathcal{U}$. Then $\dim \mathcal{U}^\star = \dim R = r$. We take the projection

$$\mu : \mathcal{U}^\star \times_R \mathcal{U} \simeq \{ (C, x, y) \in R \times Y \times Y \mid (C, x) \in \mathcal{U}^\star, (C, y) \in \mathcal{U} \} \to \mathrm{ev}(\mathcal{U}^\star) \times Y,$$

such that $\mu(C, x, y) = (x, y)$, where $\mathrm{ev} : \mathcal{U} \to Y$ is the second projection.

Let $(C, x, y) \in \mathcal{U}^\star \times_R \mathcal{U}$ be general. (Then $x, y \in C \subset \mathbb{T}_x X$.) We can take the unique irreducible component $R_x^{\star\prime} \subset R_x^\star$ containing C, and take the unique irreducible component $R'_{xy} \subset R_{xy}$ containing C. (The uniqueness comes from the general choice of C.)

Lemma 3.5. *In the above setting, we have $R'_{xy} \subset R_x^{\star\prime}$.*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 3.4. □

Moreover, we have the following proposition. Here for the projection $\mathrm{im}(\mu) \to \mathrm{ev}(\mathcal{U}^\star) : (x, y) \mapsto x$, we also consider a fiber product

$$\mathrm{im}(\mu) \times_{\mathrm{ev}(\mathcal{U}^\star)} \mathrm{im}(\mu) \simeq \{ (x, y, z) \in \mathrm{ev}(\mathcal{U}^\star) \times Y \times Y \mid (x, y), (x, z) \in \mathrm{im}(\mu) \}.$$

Note that the projection $\mathrm{im}(\mu) \times_{\mathrm{ev}(\mathcal{U}^\star)} \mathrm{im}(\mu) \to Y \times Y$ is dominant.

Proposition 3.6. *Assume $(d, \dim Y) = (6, n-3)$ and the formula (3). Then the following holds.*

(a) $\mathrm{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime}) = \mathrm{Loc}(R'_{xy})$ *and the dimension is $n-4$ for general $(C, x, y) \in \mathcal{U}^\star \times_R \mathcal{U}$.*
(b) $\langle \mathrm{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime}) \rangle$ *is an $(n-3)$-plane of $\mathbb{P}^n$ for general $(C, x) \in \mathcal{U}^\star$.*
(c) *The projection*

$$\mathcal{U}^\star \times_R \mathcal{U} \times_R \mathcal{U} \to \mathrm{im}(\mu) \times_{\mathrm{ev}(\mathcal{U}^\star)} \mathrm{im}(\mu)$$

defined by $(C, x, y, z) \mapsto (x, y, z)$ is dominant, where $(C, x) \in \mathcal{U}^\star$ and $y, z \in C$.
(d) *Let $(C, x, y, z) \in \mathcal{U}^\star \times_R \mathcal{U} \times_R \mathcal{U}$ be general ($x, y, z \in C \subset \mathbb{T}_x X$). Then $\mathrm{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime}) = \mathrm{Loc}(R'_{yz})$, where $R'_{yz} \subset R_{yz}$ is the unique irreducible component containing C.*

Roughly speaking, since $\langle \operatorname{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime}) \rangle$ is an $(n-3)$-plane as in (b) of this proposition, we will find that $\langle Y \rangle$ is an $(n-2)$-plane in many cases, and then get a contradiction to Proposition 2.6.

In order to prove this proposition, we show the following two lemmas.

Lemma 3.7. $\dim \operatorname{ev}(\mathcal{U}^\star) \subset Y$ *is of dimension* $\geqslant n-5$. *Hence* $\operatorname{Loc}(R_x^\star) \neq Y$ *for general* $x \in \operatorname{ev}(\mathcal{U}^\star)$.

Proof. Let $(C, x, y) \in \mathcal{U}^\star \times_R \mathcal{U}$ be general such that $\langle C \rangle \not\subset X$. Considering the morphism μ, $R_x^{\star\prime} \cap R_y \subset R_{xy}$ is of dimension $\geqslant r+1-\dim \operatorname{ev}(\mathcal{U}^\star) - \dim Y$. From Lemma 2.1, $r+2-\dim \operatorname{ev}(\mathcal{U}^\star)-\dim Y \leqslant \dim Y$. Hence $\operatorname{ev}(\mathcal{U}^\star) \geqslant r+2-2\dim(Y)$, where the right hand side is $\geqslant n-5$.

Since $n \geqslant 6$, $\operatorname{ev}(\mathcal{U}^\star)$ has positive dimension. On the other hand, we have $\#\{\, x \in \operatorname{ev}(\mathcal{U}^\star) \mid \operatorname{Loc}(R_x^\star) = Y \,\} < \infty$ as follows. If $\operatorname{Loc}(R_x^\star) = Y$, then $Y \subset \mathbb{T}_x X$ and then $\langle Y \rangle = \mathbb{T}_x X$ because of Proposition 2.6. Hence, by the finiteness of the Gauss map of smooth X, we have the assertion. □

Lemma 3.8. *Let* $S \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ *be a non-linear projective variety. Assume* $\operatorname{Cone}_x S = \operatorname{Cone}_y S$ *for general* $x, y \in S$. *Then* $\langle S \rangle \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ *is a* $(\dim(S)+1)$*-plane.*

Proof. Take a general point $x \in S$. Then we have $\pi_x(S) = \pi_x(\operatorname{Cone}_x S) = \pi_x(\operatorname{Cone}_y S) = \operatorname{Cone}_{\pi_x(y)}(\pi_x(S))$ for general $y \in S$. Hence $\pi_x(S) = \operatorname{Cone}_{y'}(\pi_x(S))$ for general $y' \in \pi_x(S)$. This means that $\pi_x(S)$ is a $(\dim(S))$-plane. Hence $\operatorname{Cone}_x S$ is a $(\dim(S)+1)$-plane, which implies the assertion. □

Proof of Proposition 3.6. (a) We may assume $\langle C \rangle \not\subset X$. From Lemma 2.1 and the formula (4), we have $\dim \operatorname{Loc}(R'_{xy}) \geqslant n-4$. On the other hand, Lemma 3.7 implies $\operatorname{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime}) \leqslant n-4$. Hence Lemma 3.5 implies $\operatorname{Loc}(R'_{xy}) = \operatorname{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime})$ and the dimension is $n-4$.

(b) From (a), for general $y \in \operatorname{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime})$, it follows $\operatorname{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime}) = \operatorname{Loc}(R'_{xy})$, where the right hand side is the closure of $\bigcup_{C \in R'_{xy}} C \subset \mathbb{P}^n$. Since $\operatorname{Cone}_x C = \langle C \rangle = \operatorname{Cone}_y C$,

$$P_x := \operatorname{Cone}_x \operatorname{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime}) = \overline{\bigcup_{C \in R'_{xy}} \langle C \rangle} = \operatorname{Cone}_y \operatorname{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime}).$$

For two general points $y_1, y_2 \in \operatorname{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime})$, we have $\operatorname{Cone}_{y_1} \operatorname{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime}) = P_x = \operatorname{Cone}_{y_2} \operatorname{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime})$. Hence the assertion follows from Lemma 3.8.

(c) Since $\operatorname{im}(\mu) \times_{\operatorname{ev}(\mathcal{U}^\star)} \operatorname{im}(\mu)$ is irreducible, it is sufficient to show that, for general $x \in \operatorname{ev}(\mathcal{U}^\star)$ and for general $y, z \in \operatorname{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime})$, there exists C such that $(C, x, y, z) \in \mathcal{U}^\star \times_R \mathcal{U} \times_R \mathcal{U}$.

First we can take a general $(C_0, x, y) \in \mathcal{U}^\star \times_R \mathcal{U}$ with some $C_0 \in R_x^{\star\prime}$. From (a), we have $\operatorname{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime}) = \operatorname{Loc}(R'_{xy})$. Since $z \in \operatorname{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime})$ is general, we have a general

$C \in R'_{xy}$ such that $z \in C$. From Lemma 3.5, this C satisfies the condition of our assertion.

(d) Consider the projection

$$\mathrm{pr}_{34} : \mathcal{U}^\star \times_R \mathcal{U} \times_R \mathcal{U} \to Y \times Y$$

sending $(C, x, y, z) \mapsto (y, z)$. Let F_{yz} be an irreducible component of the fiber of pr_{34} at a general $(y, z) \in Y \times Y$. We identify F_{yz} and its image in $\mathcal{U}^\star$ under the projection $\mathrm{pr}_{12} : (C, x, y, z) \mapsto (C, x)$.

Let us consider

$$\bigcup_{(C,x)\in F_{yz}:\ \text{general}} \mathrm{Loc}(R^{\star\prime}_x) \quad \subset \quad \bigcup_{(C,x)\in F_{yz}:\ \text{general}} \langle\, \mathrm{Loc}(R^{\star\prime}_x) \,\rangle.$$

Suppose that the closure of the left hand side is equal to Y. Then (b) implies

$$\mathrm{Cone}_y Y = \mathrm{Cone}_y \overline{\bigcup_{(C,x)} \mathrm{Loc}(R^{\star\prime}_x)} = \overline{\bigcup_{(C,x)} \langle\, \mathrm{Loc}(R^{\star\prime}_x) \,\rangle}.$$

In the same way, $\mathrm{Cone}_z Y = \overline{\bigcup_{(C,x)} \langle\, \mathrm{Loc}(R^{\star\prime}_x) \,\rangle}$. Hence $\mathrm{Cone}_y Y = \mathrm{Cone}_z Y$. Since $y, z \in Y$ are general, Lemma 3.8 implies that $\langle\, Y \,\rangle \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is an $(n-2)$-plane, which contradicts Proposition 2.6.

Hence the closure of $\bigcup_{(C,x)\in F_{yz}:\ \text{general}} \mathrm{Loc}(R^{\star\prime}_x)$ is not equal to Y. Since $\mathrm{Loc}(R^{\star\prime}_x)$ is of codimension 1 in Y, it means that $L := \mathrm{Loc}(R^{\star\prime}_x)$ is constant for general $(C, x) \in F_{yz}$. Then $\mathrm{Loc}(R'_{yz}) = \overline{\bigcup_{(C,x)\in F_{yz}:\ \text{general}} C} \subset L$. Since $\dim \mathrm{Loc}(R'_{yz}) \geqslant n-4$, the assertion follows. □

Using the above results and notations, we now prove the main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $R \neq \emptyset$ be an irreducible component of $R_2(X)$ satisfying the condition (1). From Lemma 2.3, we can assume $(d, \dim Y) = (6, n-3)$ and the formula (3).

Claim 3.9. *For general $(C, x) \in \mathcal{U}^\star$, $\mathrm{Loc}(R^{\star\prime}_x) \subset \langle\, \mathrm{Loc}(R^{\star\prime}_x) \,\rangle = \mathbb{P}^{n-3}$ is a quadric hypersurface.*

Proof. Let $y, z \in \mathrm{Loc}(R^{\star\prime}_x)$ be general. Let $M \subset \langle\, \mathrm{Loc}(R^{\star\prime}_x) \,\rangle$ be a general 2-plane such that $y, z \in M$.

From Proposition 3.6(c), (C_0, x, y, z) is general in $\mathcal{U}^\star \times_R \mathcal{U} \times_R \mathcal{U}$ with some C_0. From (d), it holds that $\mathrm{Loc}(R'_{yz}) = \mathrm{Loc}(R^{\star\prime}_x)$. We consider

$$R'_{yz} \to \langle\, yz \,\rangle^* : C \mapsto \langle\, C \,\rangle,$$

which is generically finite, where $\langle\, yz \,\rangle^* \subset \mathbb{G}(2, \langle\, \mathrm{Loc}(R^{\star\prime}_x) \,\rangle)$ is the set of 2-planes containing the line $\langle\, yz \,\rangle$. Since $\dim R'_{yz} \geqslant n-5 = \dim \langle\, yz \,\rangle^*$, this morphism is dominant.

Thus we can take a general $\tilde{M} \in \langle yz \rangle^* \subset \mathbb{G}(2, \langle \operatorname{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime}) \rangle)$ near M such that $\tilde{M} = \langle \tilde{C} \rangle$ for some $\tilde{C} \in R'_{yz}$. By generality, $\tilde{M} \cap \operatorname{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime})$ is irreducible. Hence $\tilde{C} = \tilde{M} \cap \operatorname{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime})$, which means that $\deg(\operatorname{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime})) = 2$. □

Now we write $L_{yz} := \operatorname{Loc}(R'_{yz})$ for general $(C, y, z) \in \mathcal{U} \times_R \mathcal{U}$.

Claim 3.10. *$L_{yz} = L_{\tilde{y}z}$ holds for general $(\tilde{C}, \tilde{y}) \in \mathcal{U}_{R'_{yz}}$.*

Proof. Since $(\tilde{C}, y, z, \tilde{y})$ is general in $\mathcal{U} \times_R \mathcal{U} \times_R \mathcal{U}$, R'_{yz} (resp. $R'_{\tilde{y}z}$) is the unique irreducible component of R_{yz} (resp. $R_{\tilde{y}z}$) containing $\tilde{C}$. We can take $x \in \tilde{C}$ such that $(\tilde{C}, x)$ is general $\mathcal{U}^\star$. Then Proposition 3.6(d) implies $L_{yz} = \operatorname{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime}) = L_{\tilde{y}z}$. □

Note that $\langle L_{yz} \rangle = \langle \operatorname{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime}) \rangle = \mathbb{P}^{n-3}$. For general $y, z_1, z_2 \in Y$ (with some C_i such that (C_i, y, z_i) is general in $\mathcal{U} \times_R \mathcal{U}$), we write

$$K_y^{z_1 z_2} := \mathbb{T}_y L_{yz_1} \cap \mathbb{T}_y L_{yz_2} \subset \mathbb{T}_y Y,$$

whose dimension is $\geqslant n-5$. Then $y \in K_y^{z_1 z_2} \subset \langle L_{yz_1} \rangle \cap \langle L_{yz_2} \rangle$. (Here we do not know "$z_i \in K_y^{z_1 z_2}$".)

Claim 3.11. $\dim(\langle L_{yz_1} \rangle \cap \langle L_{yz_2} \rangle) = n-5$. *Hence $K_y^{z_1 z_2} = \langle L_{yz_1} \rangle \cap \langle L_{yz_2} \rangle$.*

Proof. Suppose $\dim\langle L_{yz_1} \rangle \cap \langle L_{yz_2} \rangle \geqslant n-4$ for general $y, z_1, z_2 \in Y$. First we take general points $y_0, z_1, z_2 \in Y$. By generality, $z_1 \notin \langle L_{y_0 z_2} \rangle$. For general $y \in L_{y_0 z_2}$, we have $\langle L_{yz_2} \rangle = \langle L_{y_0 z_2} \rangle$ because of Claim 3.10. Consider an open subset $Y^\circ \subset Y$ containing y_0 such that $\dim\langle L_{yz_1} \rangle \cap \langle L_{yz_2} \rangle \geqslant n-4$ for $y \in Y^\circ$.

Since $Y = \overline{\bigcup_{y \in L_{y_0 z_2} \cap Y^\circ} L_{yz_1}}$, we have

$$\operatorname{Cone}_{z_1} Y = \overline{\bigcup_{y \in L_{y_0 z_2} \cap Y^\circ} \langle L_{yz_1} \rangle},$$

where the right hand side contains $L_{y_0 z_2}$; in fact, it contains the $(n-3)$-plane $\langle L_{y_0 z_2} \rangle$ since each $\langle L_{yz_1} \rangle$ satisfies $\dim(\langle L_{yz_1} \rangle \cap \langle L_{y_0 z_2} \rangle) \geqslant n-4$. Hence $\operatorname{Cone}_{z_1} Y = \operatorname{Cone}_{z_1} \langle L_{y_0 z_2} \rangle$, which is an $(n-2)$-plane, contradicting Proposition 2.6. □

Claim 3.12. *$K_y^{z_1 z_2} \subset L_{yz_1}$. Hence there exists an irreducible component $K_y^{z_1}$ of $L_{yz_1} \cap \mathbb{T}_y L_{yz_1} \subset \langle L_{yz_1} \rangle$ such that $K_y^{z_1} = K_y^{z_1 z_2}$ for general $z_2 \in Y$.*

Proof. Suppose $K_y^{z_1 z_2} \not\subset L_{yz_1}$. Let $z, w \in Y$ be general such that $w \notin L_{yz}$. For general $\tilde{y} \in L_{yz}$, we have $L_{\tilde{y}z} = L_{yz}$.

Since Y is the closure of $\bigcup_{\tilde{y} \in L_{yz}\colon \text{general}} L_{\tilde{y}w}$, we have that $\operatorname{Cone}_w Y$ is the closure of $\bigcup_{\tilde{y} \in L_{yz}\colon \text{general}} \langle L_{\tilde{y}w} \rangle$. Since $\tilde{y} \in \langle L_{yz} \rangle \cap \langle L_{\tilde{y}w} \rangle = K_{\tilde{y}}^{zw}$, we have $L_{yz} \subset$

$\overline{\bigcup_{\tilde{y}\in L_{yz}:\,\text{general}} K_{\tilde{y}}^{zw}}$. Moreover, since L_{yz} is codimension one in $\langle\, L_{yz}\,\rangle = \mathbb{P}^{n-3}$, and since $K_{\tilde{y}}^{zw} \not\subset L_{yz}$, we have

$$\langle\, L_{yz}\,\rangle \subset \overline{\bigcup_{\tilde{y}\in L_{yz}:\,\text{general}} K_{\tilde{y}}^{zw}}.$$

Since the right hand side is contained in $\overline{\bigcup_{\tilde{y}\in L_{yz}:\,\text{general}}\langle\, L_{\tilde{y}w}\,\rangle}$, it holds $\langle\, L_{yz}\,\rangle \subset \mathrm{Cone}_w Y$. Then $\mathrm{Cone}_w\langle\, L_{yz}\,\rangle \subset \mathrm{Cone}_w Y$, where the left hand side is an $(n-2)$-plane and the right hand side is of dimension $(n-2)$. It holds that $\mathrm{Cone}_w Y$ is an $(n-2)$-plane, a contradiction to Proposition 2.6.

Note that, since $K_y^{z_1z_2}$ is contained in $L_{yz_1} \cap \mathbb{T}_y L_{yz_1} \subset \langle\, L_{yz_1}\,\rangle$, there exists an irreducible component of $L_{yz_1} \cap \mathbb{T}_y L_{yz_1}$ which is equal to $K_y^{z_1z_2}$ for general $z_2 \in Y$. Hence the latter statement holds. □

Let $y, z_1 \in Y$ be general. Since Y is the closure of $\bigcup_{z_2\in Y:\,\text{general}} L_{yz_2}$, it follows that $\mathrm{Cone}_y Y$ is the closure of $\bigcup_{z_2\in Y:\,\text{general}}\langle\, L_{yz_2}\,\rangle$. Since $K_y^{z_1} = K_y^{z_1z_2} \subset \langle\, L_{yz_2}\,\rangle$ for general $z_2 \in Y$, we have that $\mathrm{Cone}_y Y$ is a cone with vertex $K_y^{z_1} = \mathbb{P}^{n-5}$. Thus $\pi_{K_y^{z_1}}(Y) \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ is of dimension 2 for the linear projection $\pi_{K_y^{z_1}} : \mathbb{P}^n \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^4$.

Let $\tilde{y}, \tilde{z}_1 \in Y$ be general. We may assume $\tilde{y} \notin K_y^{z_1}$ and $y \notin K_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{z}_1}$. We complete the proof in the following two steps.

Step 1. Suppose $\dim(K_y^{z_1} \cap K_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{z}_1}) = n-6$. Then $K_y^{z_1} \cap K_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{z}_1} = \mathbb{P}^{n-6} \subset K_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{z}_1} = \mathbb{P}^{n-5} \subset \mathbb{P}^n$. Here, $\pi_y(Y) \subset \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ is a cone with vertex $\pi_y(K_y^{z_1})$. Since $\dim \pi_y(K_y^{z_1}) = n-6$, we have that $\pi_y(K_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{z}_1})$ contains $\pi_y(K_y^{z_1})$. Thus $\pi_{K_y^{z_1}}(Y)$ is a cone with vertex $\pi_{K_y^{z_1}}(K_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{z}_1}) = \pi_{K_y^{z_1}}(\tilde{y})$. Since $\tilde{y} \in Y$ is general, this means that $\pi_{K_y^{z_1}}(Y)$ is a 2-plane. Thus $\mathrm{Cone}_y Y$ is an $(n-2)$-plane, which contradicts Proposition 2.6.

Step 2. Suppose $\dim(K_y^{z_1} \cap K_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{z}_1}) \leqslant n-7$. We have $K_y^{z_1} = K_y^{z_1\tilde{y}} \subset L_{y\tilde{y}} \subset \langle\, L_{y\tilde{y}}\,\rangle$. In the same way, $K_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{z}_1} \subset L_{y\tilde{y}}$. Since $K_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{z}_1} = \langle\, L_{\tilde{y}\tilde{z}_1}\,\rangle \cap \langle\, L_{y\tilde{y}}\,\rangle$, we have

$$\dim(K_y^{z_1} \cap \langle\, L_{\tilde{y}\tilde{z}_1}\,\rangle) = \dim(K_y^{z_1} \cap K_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{z}_1}) \leqslant n-7.$$

We consider the cone $\pi_y(Y) \subset \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ with vertex $\pi_y(K_y^{z_1})$. Since $\pi_y(K_y^{z_1}) \cap \pi_y(\langle\, L_{\tilde{y}\tilde{z}_1}\,\rangle)$ is of dimension $\leqslant n-7$, we can find $v \in \pi_y(K_y^{z_1}) \setminus \pi_y(\langle\, L_{\tilde{y}\tilde{z}_1}\,\rangle)$. Since $\pi_y(L_{\tilde{y}\tilde{z}_1})$ is of codimension 1 in $\pi_y(Y)$, it follows that $\pi_y(Y)$ is a cone of $\pi_y(L_{\tilde{y}\tilde{z}_1})$ with vertex v. From Proposition 3.6(d), we have $L_{\tilde{y}\tilde{z}_1} = \mathrm{Loc}(R_x^{\star\prime})$ for some general $x \in Y$. From Claim 3.9, $\pi_y(Y)$ is a (singular) quadric hypersurface in $\langle\, \pi_y(Y)\,\rangle = \mathbb{P}^{n-2}$. Since $y \in Y$ is general, it follows that Y is a projective variety of degree 3 of codimension 2 in $\langle\, Y\,\rangle = \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$.

We take $X' := X \cap \langle\, Y\,\rangle$. Since the Gauss map $\gamma : X \to (\mathbb{P}^n)^\vee$ is finite, X' is singular at most finitely many points (X' is singular at x if and only if $\gamma(x) = \langle\, Y\,\rangle$

in $(\mathbb{P}^n)^\vee$). In particular, X' is irreducible. (This is because, if $X' = X'_1 \cup X'_2 \subset \langle Y \rangle = \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$, then $X'_1 \cap X'_2 \subset \operatorname{Sing} X'$.) Here $Y \subset X' \subset \langle Y \rangle$.

We can take a general hyperplane $M \subset \langle Y \rangle = \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ such that $X'' := X' \cap M$ is smooth. The degree of $X'' \subset M = \mathbb{P}^{n-2}$ is equal to $\deg(X) = 6$, and $Y \cap M \subset X''$ is of codimension 1 in X'' and degree 3 in $\mathbb{P}^{n-2}$. This is a contradiction since $\operatorname{Pic}(\mathbb{P}^{n-2}) \simeq \mathbb{Z} \to \operatorname{Pic}(X'') : \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)|_{X''}$ is isomorphic due to the Lefschetz theorem. □

Example 3.13. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^7$ be the Fermat hypersurface of degree 6. Then $\mathbb{P}^3 \subset X$. Thus $R_2(\mathbb{P}^3) \subset R_2(X)$ is of dimension 8, and the expected dimension of $R_2(X)$ is $3n - 2d - 2 = 7$. For a general hyperplane $\mathbb{P}^6 \subset \mathbb{P}^7$, we have $\mathbb{P}^2 \subset X_1 := X \cap \mathbb{P}^6$. Then $R_2(\mathbb{P}^2) \subset R_2(X_1)$ is of dimension 5 and the expected dimension of $R_2(X_1)$ is 4.

In these examples, each $C \in R_2(\mathbb{P}^3)$ (resp. $C \in R_2(\mathbb{P}^2)$) satisfies $\langle C \rangle \subset \mathbb{P}^3 \subset X$ (resp. $\langle C \rangle = \mathbb{P}^2 \subset X_1$).

Example 3.14. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^{10}$ be the smooth hypersurface of degree 10 defined by the following polynomial,

$$f := x_0^8(x_0^2 + x_1^2 + x_2^2) + \sum_{i=1}^{5} x_i^{10} - \sum_{i=1}^{5} x_{i+5}^{10}.$$

Then the expected dimension of $R_2(X)$ is 8. We consider the 5-plane

$$M := \bigcap_{i=1}^{5} (x_i - x_{i+5} = 0) = \mathbb{P}^5 \subset \mathbb{P}^{10},$$

and take $Y \subset X \cap M$, to be the zero set of $x_0^2 + x_1^2 + x_2^2$ in M. Since Y is a cone of the conic $(x_0^2 + x_1^2 + x_2^2 = 0) \subset \mathbb{P}^2$, we have a birational map $R_2(Y) \to \mathbb{G}(2, \mathbb{P}^5) : C \mapsto \langle C \rangle$. In particular, $\dim R_2(Y) = 9$. Thus, for an irreducible component $R \subset R_2(X)$ containing $R_2(Y)$, the dimension of R is greater that the expected dimension.

Acknowledgments. The author was supported by the Grant-in-Aid for JSPS fellows, No. 16J00404.

References

[1] W. Barth and A. Van de Ven. Fano varieties of lines on hypersurfaces. Arch. Math. (Basel) **31** (1978/79), 96–104.
[2] R. Beheshti, Lines on projective hypersurfaces. J. Reine Angew. Math. **592** (2006), 1–21.
[3] R. Beheshti, Hypersurfaces with too many rational curves, Math. Ann. **360** (2014), 753–768.
[4] R. Behesti and N. M. Kumar. Spaces of rational curves in complete intersections. Compositio Mathematica, **149** (2013), 1041–1060.
[5] A. Collino, J. P. Murre, G. E. Welters, On the family of conics lying on a quartic threefold, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino **38** (1980), 151–181.

[6] K. Furukawa, Rational curves on hypersurfaces, J. reine angew. Math. **665** (2012), 157-188.
[7] J. Harris, M. Roth, and J. Starr. Rational curves on hypersurfaces of low degree. J. Reine Angew. Math. **571** (2004), 73–106.
[8] J. Harris and J. Starr. Rational curves on hypersurfaces of low degree. II. Compos. Math. **141** (2005), 35–92.
[9] J. Kollár, Rational curves on algebraic varieties, Ergeb. Math. Grenzgeb. (3) **32**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1996.
[10] J. M. Landsberg and C. Robles, Fubini's theorem in codimension two. J. Reine Angew. Math. **631** (2009), 221–235 .
[11] E. Riedl and D. Yang, Kontsevich spaces of rational curves on Fano hypersurfaces, arXiv:1409.3802.
[12] J. Starr. The Kodaira dimension of spaces of rational curves on low degree hypersurfaces, arXiv:math/0305432.
[13] F. L. Zak, Tangents and secants of algebraic varieties. Transl. Math. Monographs **127**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1993.

Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, the University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

E-mail address: katu@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp